

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION

ERIK GARCIA, )  
vs. )  
Plaintiff, ) CIVIL ACTION  
9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, ) Case No. 4:23-CV-03867  
Defendant. )

**COMPLAINT**

COMES NOW, ERIK GARCIA, by and through the undersigned counsel, and files this, his Complaint against Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”) and the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”). In support thereof, Plaintiff respectfully shows this Court as follows:

**JURISDICTION**

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1334 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon Defendant’s failure to remove physical barriers to access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

**PARTIES**

2. Plaintiff, ERIK GARCIA (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) is, and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in Houston, Texas (Harris County).

3. Plaintiff is disabled as defined by the ADA.

4. Plaintiff is required to traverse in a wheelchair and is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking and standing.

5. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

6. In addition to being a customer of the public accommodation on the Property, Plaintiff is also an independent advocate for the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a “tester” for the purpose of enforcing Plaintiff’s civil rights, monitoring, determining and ensuring whether places of public accommodation are in compliance with the ADA. Her motivation to return to a location, in part, stems from a desire to utilize ADA litigation to make Plaintiff’s community more accessible for Plaintiff and others; and pledges to do whatever is necessary to demonstrate the plausibility of Plaintiff returning to the Property once the barriers to access identified in this Complaint are removed in order to strengthen the already existing standing to confer jurisdiction upon this Court so an injunction can be issued correcting the numerous ADA violations on this property. (“Advocacy Purposes”).

7. Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC (hereinafter “9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC”), is a Delaware limited liability corporation that transacts business in the State of Texas and within this judicial district.

8. Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, may be properly served with process for service via its Registered Agent, to wit: c/o CT Corporation System, Registered Agent, 1999 Bryan Street, Suite 900, Dallas, TX 75201.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

9. On or about March 25, 2023, Plaintiff was a customer at “Rio Ranch Restaurant” a business located at 9999 Westheimer Road, Houston, TX 77042 referenced herein as “Rio Ranch”. Attached is a receipt documenting Plaintiff’s purchase. *See Exhibit 1.* Also attached is a photograph documenting Plaintiff’s visit to the Property. *See Exhibit 2.*

10. Plaintiff lives only 7 miles from the Property.

11. Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, is the owner or co-owner of the real property and improvements that Rio Ranch is situated upon and that is the subject of this action, referenced herein as the “Property.”

12. Plaintiff’s access to the businesses located 9999 Westheimer Road, Houston, TX 77042, Harris County Property Appraiser’s identification number 1101410000005 (“the Property”), and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, foods, drinks, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein were denied and/or limited because of his disabilities, and he will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, is compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those set forth in this Complaint.

13. Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, as property owner, is responsible for complying with the ADA for both the exterior portions and interior portions of the Property. Even if there is a lease between Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, and the tenant allocating responsibilities for ADA compliance within the unit the tenant operates, that lease is only between the property owner and the tenant and does not abrogate the Defendant’s independent requirement to comply with the ADA for the entire Property it owns, including the interior portions of the Property which are public accommodations. *See 28 CFR § 36.201(b).*

14. Plaintiff has visited the Property at least once before as a customer and advocate for the disabled. Plaintiff intends to revisit the Property within six months after the barriers to access detailed in this Complaint are removed and the Property is accessible again. The purpose of the revisit is to be a return customer, a new customer to other stores at the Property, to

determine if and when the Property is made accessible and for Advocacy Purposes.

15. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property to purchase goods and/or services as a return customer living in the near vicinity as well as for Advocacy Purposes but does not intend to re-expose himself to the ongoing barriers to access and engage in a futile gesture of visiting the public accommodation known to Plaintiff to have numerous and continuing barriers to access.

16. Plaintiff travelled to the Property as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, personally encountered many barriers to access the Property that are detailed in this Complaint, engaged many barriers, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury if all the illegal barriers to access present at the Property identified in this Complaint are not removed.

17. Although Plaintiff did not personally encounter each and every barrier to access identified in Plaintiff's Complaint, Plaintiff became aware of all identified barriers prior to filing the Complaint and because Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property as a customer and advocate for the disabled within six months or sooner after the barriers to access are removed, it is likely that despite not actually encountering a particular barrier to access on one visit, Plaintiff may encounter a different barrier to access identified in the complaint in a subsequent visit as, for example, one accessible parking space may not be available and he would need to use an alternative accessible parking space in the future on his subsequent visit. As such, all barriers to access identified in the Complaint must be removed in order to ensure Plaintiff will not be exposed to barriers to access and legally protected injury.

18. Plaintiff's inability to fully access the Property and the stores within in a safe manner and in a manner which inhibits the free and equal enjoyment of the goods and services

offered at the Property, both now and into the foreseeable future, constitutes an injury in fact as recognized by Congress and is historically viewed by Federal Courts as an inquiry in fact.

**COUNT I**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA AND ADAAG**

19. On July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*

20. Congress found, among other things, that:

- (i) some 43,000,000 Americans have one or more physical or mental disabilities, and this number is increasing as the population as a whole is growing older;
- (ii) historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;
- (iii) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;
- (iv) individuals with disabilities continually encounter various forms of discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the discriminatory effects of architectural, transportation, and communication barriers, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to lesser service, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities; and
- (v) the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and non-productivity.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(1) - (3), (5) and (9).

21. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:

- (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
- (ii) provide a clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and

\* \* \* \* \*

- (iv) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).

22. The congressional legislation provided places of public accommodation one and a half years from the enactment of the ADA to implement its requirements.

23. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

24. The Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

25. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

26. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

27. The Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

28. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed the Property in his capacity as a customer at the Property as well as an independent advocate for the disabled, but could not fully do so because of his disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to access,

dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

29. Plaintiff intends to visit the Property again in the very near future as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered at the Property, but will be unable to fully do so because of his disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

30. Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, has discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying his access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

31. Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, is compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the Property, including those specifically set forth herein, and make the Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities.

32. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA

violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed, or was made aware of prior to the filing of this Complaint, that precluded and/or limited Plaintiff's access to the Property and the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Property include, but are not limited to:

**ACCESSIBLE ELEMENTS:**

- i. East of the entrance to Rio Rancho, three of the five accessible parking spaces are missing identification signs in violation of Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.
- ii. Nearest the entrance Dan Phil's Hair Salon, the Property has an accessible ramp leading from an accessible parking space to the accessible entrances with a slope exceeding 1:12 in violation of Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property because when ramps are too steep (more than 1:12) it requires too much physical arm strain to wheel up the ramp and increases the likelihood of the wheelchair falling backwards and Plaintiff being injured.
- iii. Leading to Dan Phil's Hair Salon, the Property has an accessible ramp that lacks finished edges or edge protection and/or is otherwise in violation of Section 405.9 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would expose Plaintiff to increased risk of injury for if the wheelchair should fall off the side edge of the ramp, the lack of edge protection would likely cause Plaintiff to tip and incur injury.

- iv. Nearest Rio Ranch Restaurant, the Property has an accessible ramp leading from the two accessible parking spaces to the accessible entrances with a slope exceeding 1:10 in violation of Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property because when ramps are too steep (more than 1:12) it requires too much physical arm strain to wheel up the ramp and increases the likelihood of the wheelchair falling backwards and Plaintiff being injured.
- v. As a result of the barrier to access referenced in (iv), the Property lacks an accessible route from these two accessible parking spaces to the accessible entrance of the Property in violation of Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- vi. Nearest the accessible entrance Rio Ranch Restaurant, the access aisle to the two accessible parking spaces is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the lift from the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface.
- vii. Nearest the accessible entrance Rio Ranch Restaurant, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the two accessible parking spaces in violation of Section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to

- exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the lift from the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface.
- viii. Nearest the accessible entrance Rio Ranch Restaurant, the two accessible parking spaces are not level due to the presence of accessible ramp side flares in the accessible parking spaces in violation of Sections 502.4 and 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle.
- ix. Nearest the accessible entrance Rio Ranch Restaurant, the Property has an accessible ramp leading from the accessible parking spaces to the accessible entrances with a slope exceeding 1:12 in violation of Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property because when ramps are too steep (more than 1:12) it requires too much physical arm strain to wheel up the ramp and increases the likelihood of the wheelchair falling backwards and Plaintiff being injured.
- x. At the accessible entrance Rio Ranch Restaurant, the maneuvering clearance of this accessible entrance is not level (surface slope in excess of 1:48) in violation of Section 404.2.4.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access this unit of the Property since it is often necessary for individuals in wheelchairs to need to use their hands to both wheel through the doorway and keep the door open with another

hand. When the maneuvering clearance is not level, this ordinarily difficult process is made even more difficult by the inappropriately higher slope.

- xi. Due to the barrier to access identified in (x) above, not all entrance doors and doorways comply with Section 404 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, this is a violation of Section 206.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- xii. Inside Rio Ranch Restaurant, the bar is lacking any portion of the counter that has a maximum height of 34 (thirty-four) inches from the finished floor in violation of Section 902.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, all portions of the bar exceed 34 (thirty-four) inches in height from the finished floor. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to enjoy the unique eating experience at the bar.
- xiii. Near the southern entrance by the rotating door, the Property has an accessible ramp leading from the accessible parking space (across the vehicular way) to the accessible entrances with a slope exceeding 1:10 in violation of Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property because when ramps are too steep (more than 1:12) it requires too much physical arm strain to wheel up the ramp and increases the likelihood of the wheelchair falling backwards and Plaintiff being injured.
- xiv. As a result of the barrier to access referenced in (xiii), and due to the fact this accessible ramp is the only accessible ramp serving the accessible parking space, the Property lacks an accessible route from the accessible parking space

closest to this ramp to the accessible entrances of the Property in violation of Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

- xv. In front of the accessible entrance to the Hilton, one of the seven accessible parking spaces is missing an identification sign in violation of Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.
- xvi. In front of the accessible entrance to the Hilton, all of the accessible ramps leading from the accessible parking spaces to the accessible entrances have a slope exceeding 1:10 in violation of Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property because when ramps are too steep (more than 1:12) it requires too much physical arm strain to wheel up the ramp and increases the likelihood of the wheelchair falling backwards and Plaintiff being injured.
- xvii. As a result of the barrier to access referenced in (xvi), the Property lacks an accessible route from these accessible parking spaces to the accessible entrances of the Property in violation of Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- xviii. In front of the accessible entrance to the Hilton, the ground surfaces of one of the seven accessible parking spaces have vertical rises in excess of  $\frac{1}{4}$  (one quarter) inch in height, are not stable or slip resistant, have broken or unstable

surfaces or otherwise fail to comply with Sections 502.4, 302 and 303 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

- xix. In front of the accessible entrance to the Hilton, the ground surfaces of one of the seven accessible parking spaces have a slope in excess of 1:48 in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards and are not level. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as Plaintiff's wheelchair may roll down the slope while entering or exiting the vehicle.
- xx. Defendant fails to adhere to a policy, practice and procedure to ensure that all facilities are readily accessible to and usable by disabled individuals.

#### **RIO RANCH RESTAURANT/HILTON RESTROOMS**

- xxi. The height of the sink exceeds the maximum height from the finished floor in violation of Section 606.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to utilize the restroom facilities.
- xxii. The accessible toilet stall door is not self-closing and violates Section 604.8.2.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for the Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely and privately utilize the restroom facilities.
- xxiii. There is inadequate (less than 1 ½ inches) spacing underneath the grab bars surrounding the toilet in violation of Section 609.3 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. The lack of spacing would make it difficult for Plaintiff to grab the

bar adequately and transfer back and forth to the wheelchair.

- xxiv. The toilet paper dispenser in the accessible toilet is not positioned seven to nine inches in front of the toilet and therefore is in violation of Section 604.7 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to utilize the toilet due to the fact the toilet paper dispenser is at an improper distance from the toilet, given Plaintiff's disability, Plaintiff would not be able to get up and reach the toilet paper.
- xxv. The door exiting the restroom lacks a clear minimum maneuvering clearance, due to the proximity of the door hardware within 18 inches to the adjacent trash can, in violation of Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely exit the restroom due to the fact individuals in wheelchairs have their feet sticking out in front of them and when there is inadequate clearance near the door (less than 18 inches), their protruding feet block their ability to reach the door hardware to open the door.
- xxvi. There are a total of 6 toilet compartments and at least three urinals in the restroom, one of the toilet compartments is attempting to comply with 604.8.1 standards, however, there is not an ambulatory toilet compartment in compliance with Section 604.8.2 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. Since there are six or more toilet compartments and urinals in this restroom, it is required, pursuant to Section 213.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards, to have an ambulatory toilet compartment (in addition to the accessible toilet compartment) in compliance with Section 604.8.2 of the 2010 ADAAG

Standards in the restroom. Given the fact that this is a high-volume restroom serving both a large hotel and the restaurant, the lack of the ambulatory stall could make it difficult for Plaintiff to find an available accessible stall.

33. The violations enumerated above may not be a complete list of the barriers, conditions or violations encountered by Plaintiff and/or which exist at the Property.

34. Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Property in order to determine all of the discriminatory conditions present at the Property in violation of the ADA.

35. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

36. All of the violations alleged herein are readily achievable to modify to the Property into compliance with the ADA.

37. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because the nature and cost of the modifications are relatively low.

38. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, have the financial resources to make the necessary modifications. According to the Property Appraiser, the Appraised value of the Property is \$17,183,985.00.

39. The removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is also readily achievable because Defendant has available to it a \$5,000.00 tax credit and up to a \$15,000.00 tax deduction from the IRS for spending money on accessibility

modifications.

40. Upon information and good faith belief, the Property has been altered since 2010.

41. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

42. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, is suffering irreparable harm, and reasonably anticipates that he will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, is required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those alleged herein.

43. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

44. The benefit to Plaintiff and the public of the relief outweighs any resulting detriment to Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC

45. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of litigation from Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188 and 12205.

46. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), this Court is provided authority to grant injunctive relief to Plaintiff, including the issuance of an Order directing Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, to modify the Property to the extent required by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays as follows:

(a) That the Court find Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;

- (b) That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, from continuing their discriminatory practices;
- (c) That the Court issue an Order requiring Defendant, 9999 WESTHEIMER ROAD, HOUSTON, LLC, to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the Property to make it readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA;
- (d) That the Court award Plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs; and
- (e) That the Court grant such further relief as deemed just and equitable in light of the circumstances.

Dated: October 12, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Douglas S. Schapiro  
Douglas S. Schapiro, Esq.  
Southern District of Texas ID No. 3182479  
The Schapiro Law Group, P.L.  
7301-A W. Palmetto Park Rd., #100A  
Boca Raton, FL 33433  
Tel: (561) 807-7388  
Email: [schapiro@schapirolawgroup.com](mailto:schapiro@schapirolawgroup.com)